Receipt Number

577061

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

JASON M. MALIK

Plaintiff.

-V-

Case: 2:08-cv-10537 Judge: Cook, Julian Abele Referral MJ: Scheer, Donald A Filed: 02-06-2008 At 12:36 PM

CMP MALIK V. SHERMETA ADAMS AND VON

ALLMEN (DA)

SHERMETA, ADAMS & VONALLMEN, P.C.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

A J. ... C. Al. ... J. .. (D52594)

Defendant.

Adam S. Alexander (P53584) The Alexander Law Firm 18930 W 10 Mile Rd Ste 2500 Southfield, MI 48075 248-246-6353 [PH] 248-246-6355 [FX]

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT

PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff Jason M. Malik ("Mr. Malik") resides in Grand Rapids, MI.
- Plaintiff Jason M. Malik ("Mr. Malik) is a consumer as defined by the Michigan Collection Practices Act M.C.L. § 445.251(d).
- 3. Jason Malik ("Mr. Malik") is a consumer as defined by the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA").
- 4. Defendant, Shermeta, Adams & Von Allmen ("Shermeta") is considered a "debt collector" as contemplated by the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA").

9

- 5. Defendant, Shermeta, Adams & Von Allmen ("Shermeta") is considered a "Person" and/or "Collection Agency" as defined by the Michigan Collection Practices Act, M.C.L. § 445.251(b)and(f). Alternatively Defendant Shermeta, Adams & Von Allmen ("Shermeta") is considered a "regulated person" under the Michigan Collection Practices Act, M.C.L. § 445.251(g).
- Defendant Shermeta is a "collection agency" under the Michigan Occupational Code
 M.C.L. §339.901(b)
- 7. Defendant Shermeta is considered a "debt collector" under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA").

JURISDICTION

- 8. This lawsuit is being brought pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692 *et seq.*, presents a Federal question and as such, jurisdiction arises under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 1337.
- 9. Plaintiffs ask this Honorable Court to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the related state law claims arising out of the same nucleus of operative facts that give rise to any Federal law claims under 28 U.S.C. §1367.
- 10. This lawsuit is being brought pursuant to the FDCPA and thus this court has jurisdiction under FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d).

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

11. Shermeta, Adams & Von Allmen is a Michigan Professional Corporation d/b/a Shermeta, Chimko & Kilpatrick, Shermeta and Adams P.C., Shermeta & Adams P.C. and Shermeta, Adams & Von Allmen, with its registered agent Douglas H. Shermeta, maintaining an office at 445 S LIVERNOIS STE 333, ROCHESTER HILLS, MI 48307.

FACTS

- 12. On or around November 13, 2007 Mr. Malik went to his Post Office box to retrieve his mail.
- 13. Upon Mr. Malik receiving his mail he had an envelope that was sent to him Certified Mail Return Receipt Requested. This letter was from Defendant Shermeta and was a Summons and Complaint from the 7th Judicial District Court.
- 14. Mr. Malik does not reside in the Jurisdiction of the 7th Judicial District Court. Moreover, Mr. Malik has not resided in the 7th Judicial District Court since January 2007.
- 15. Defendant Shermeta is aware of this as they sent Mr. Malik an initial dunning letter on or around July 2007 at Mr. Malik's previous address in Kalamazoo MI in the 8th Judicial District Court.
- 16. With regards to #15 Mr. Malik sent a timely debt validation request letter to Shermeta.
- 17. In the Complaint filed in the 7th Judicial District Court, Defendant stated that Plaintiff was within that Court's Jurisdiction. That statement is not true and is thus false and misleading pursuant to the Michigan Collection Practices Act and the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act.
- 18. That Court did not have Jurisdiction over Mr. Malik and thus this is was a violation of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act.
- 19. The same day Mr. Malik was served by Certified Mail he called Shermeta and informed them that the venue was improper and requested they dismiss the case or transfer it.
- 20. Mr. Malik also informed Shermeta that he wished to arbitrate the claims pursuant to the provisions in the card member agreement.

- 21. On or around November 28, 2007 Hon Judge T. Hentchel issued an Ex-Parte Order to Show cause why the case should not have been transferred to the proper jurisdiction of Mr. Malik the 61st District Court.
- 22. During the time from Judge Hentchel's Order until December 17th 2007 Shermeta did not stipulate with Mr. Malik to transfer or dismiss the case without prejudice, to re-file in his correct Jurisdiction.
- 23. Shermeta was fully aware that the 7th District was not the correct venue for Mr. Malik as they had him served in Grand Rapids approximately 68 miles north.
- 24. In response to the Order to Show Cause, Mr. Malik had to travel from Grand Rapids, MI to Paw Paw, MI to assert to Judge Hentchel that he already agreed that it was the wrong venue and Shermeta refused to Stipulate.
- 25. Upon transfer of the case to the 61st Judicial District on Judge Hentchel's Order Mr.
 Malik requested arbitration once again and Defendant refused.
- 26. In Defendant's Original Complaint they state that Plaintiff was within the 7th District Court's jurisdiction that was false and thus constitutes a violation.

COUNT I VIOLATIONS OF THE MICHIGAN COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 27. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all facts and allegations set forth in this Complaint.
- 28. Defendant has engaged in violations of the Michigan Collection Practices Act including but not limited to the following:
 - A. Making an inaccurate, misleading, untrue, or deceptive statement or claim in a communication to collect a debt or concealing or not revealing the purpose of a communication when it is made in connection with collecting a debt. In violation of M.C.L. § 445.252(c).

- B. Misrepresenting in a communication with a debtor 1 or more of the following:
 - i. The legal status of a legal action being taken or threatened.
 - ii. The legal rights of the creditor or debtor.
- 29. Plaintiff has suffered damages as a result of Defendant's violations of the Michigan Collection Practices Act.
- 30. Defendant's actions were willful.
- 31. To the extent that Defendant's actions were not willful they were at least negligent.

<u>COUNT II</u> VIOLATIONS OF THE MICHIGAN OCCUPATIONAL CODE

- 32. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all facts and allegations set forth in this Complaint.
- 33. Defendant has engaged in violations of the Michigan Collection Practices Act including but not limited to the following:
 - A. Making an inaccurate, misleading, untrue, or deceptive statement or claim in a communication to collect a debt or concealing or not revealing the purpose of a communication when it is made in connection with collecting a debt. In violation of M.C.L. § 339.915(e).
 - B. Misrepresenting in a communication with a debtor 1 or more of the following:
 - iii. The legal status of a legal action being taken or threatened.
 - iv. The legal rights of the creditor or debtor.
 - BB. In violation of M.C.L. § 339.915(f) et seq.
 - C. Failing to implement a procedure designed to prevent a violation by an employee. In violation of M.C.L. § 339.915(q).
- 34. Plaintiff has suffered damages as a result of Defendant's violations of the Michigan Collection Practices Act.

- 35. Defendant's actions were willful.
- 36. To the extent that Defendants actions were not willful they were at least negligent

<u>COUNT III</u> <u>VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT</u>

- 37. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all facts and allegations set forth in this Complaint.
- 38. Defendant has engaged in violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act including but not limited to the following:
 - A. Using false, misleading or unfair methods to collect a debt(s), in violation of 15
 U.S.C. §1692e.
 - B. Making false representations of: a) the character, amount, or legal status of a debt(s); or b) any service rendered or compensation which may be lawfully received by Defendants for the collection of the debt(s), in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692e(2).
 - C. Using false representations or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect debt(s) or to obtain information concerning Plaintiff, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692e(10).
 - D. Using unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect debt(s), in violation of the general prohibition in U.S.C., including, but not limited to attempting to collect of amounts not expressly authorized by the agreement creating the debt or permitted by law, 15 U.S.C §1692f(1).
 - E. Failing to send any validation notice, or a legal validation notice relating to the alleged debt(s) in violations of 15 U.S.C. §1692g(a).
 - F. Failing to bring suit in the Jurisdiction in where the debtor resides in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692(i)(B).
 - G. Failing to cease collection attempts until the alleged debt is validated upon the request of the debtor in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692

- 39. Plaintiff has suffered damages as a result of Defendant's violations of the Michigan Collection Practices Act.
- 40. Defendant's actions were willful.
- 41. To the extent that Defendants actions were not willful they were at least negligent

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter Judgment in favor of Plaintiff for:

- A. Assume jurisdiction over all claims
- B. Actual Damages
- C. Statutory Damages
- D. Treble Damages
- E. Punitive Damages
- F. Attorneys fees and costs provided by statute
- G. And any other relief this Honorable Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully Submitted,

February 01, 2008

Adam S. Alexander (P53584) The Alexander Law Firm 18930 W 10 Mile Rd Ste 2500 Southfield, MI 48075 248-246-6353 *sJS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil dealers there. (SEE DISTRICTIONS ON THE PROVIDES OF THE ROBER)

the civil docket sheet. (SEE II	NSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVI	RSE OF THE FORM.)				
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDA			
lason M. Malik			Shermeta, Adams and Von Allmen			
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff <u>F</u> EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	Kent SES)	County of Re	sidence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASE)	Oakland SONLY)	
			Case: 2:0	08-cv-10537	3	
				ook, Julian Abele		
• •	e, Address, and Telephone Numb	er)		MJ: Scheer, Donald A		
Adam S. Alexander (P5		MI 49075		-06-2008 At 12:36 PM LIK V. SHERMETA ADAMS A	ND VON	
8930 W. 10 Mile Rd. S			——— ALIMEN			
II. BASIS OF JURISE	DICTION (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only)	III. C (For Diversity Cas	es Only)	Plaintiff and One Box for Detendant)	
7.1 U.S Government Plaintuff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	Citizen of This State	PFF DEF		
□ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi	p of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State		Principal Place 3 5 3 5 Another State	
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	□ 3 □ 3 Foreign Nation	П 6 П 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Or	nly)	t trough would			
CONTRACT	TOI		FORFEITURE/PE		OTHER STATUTES	
 □ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Exel Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise □ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property 	□ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury CIVIL RIGHTS □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 444 Welfare □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	PERSONAL INJUR □ 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpracie □ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability □ 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER □ 370 Other Fraud □ 371 Truth in Lending □ 380 Other Personal □ 280 Other Personal □ 385 Property Damage □ 385 Property Damage □ 385 Property Damage □ 385 Property Damage □ 530 General □ 530 General □ 535 Death Penalty □ 540 Mandamus & Otl □ 550 Civil Rights □ 555 Prison Condition	G20 Other Food & D	28 USC 157	□ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ■ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 810 Selective Service □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 875 Customer Challenge □ 12 USC 3410 □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 894 Energy Allocation Act □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
X 1 Original □ 2 R	tate Court	Appellate Court	☐ 4 Reinstated or ☐ :	(specify) Litigation	on Magistrate Judgment	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON 15 U.S.C. 1692 Brief description of ea	et sea. use:	ction Practices Act	isdictional statutes unless diversity)	:	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTIO:			y if demanded in complaint: D: ■ Yes □ No	
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	SE(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE 2/6/08		SIGNATURE OF AT	TTORNEY OF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY						
DECEMBER 4	VMOLINT	APPLYING 1FP	1	L'DGE MAG II	UDGE	

Case 2:08-cv-10537-JAC-DAS Document 1 Filed 02/06/08 Page 9 of 9 . URSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 83.11

1.	Is this a case that has been previously dismissed?	Yes
If yes, give	the following information:	✓ No
Court:		
Case No.: _		
Judge:		
2.	Other than stated above, are there any pending or previously discontinued or dismissed companion cases in this or any other court, including state court? (Companion cases are matters in which it appears substantially similar evidence will be offered or the same or related parties are present and the cases arise out of the same transaction or occurrence.)	Yes No
If yes, give	the following information:	
Court:		
Case No.:		
Judge:		
Notes :		